

called Palestinian President Yasser Arafat.

The Palestinians were given a unique and exceptional opportunity 3 years ago at Camp David when Israel offered nearly all the land in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, control of the Muslim holy sites in Jerusalem and billions of dollars guaranteed to build an infrastructure and a new Palestinian state in exchange for two simple things: peace and an end to terrorism.

□ 1015

Arafat was in a unique historical position to finally bring peace. Instead, Arafat chose violence rather than compromises, terrorism rather than harmony. He chose to embrace cowardice and fear rather than to lead the Palestinians on the path to peace and statehood.

The United States and Israel stand together in a worldwide struggle against terrorism. However, instead of standing decisively with our strongest ally, the only democracy in the Middle East, we continue to threaten our level of aid, subjecting Israel to a quid pro quo better befitting an adolescent child than a sovereign nation. I speak of Israel's need for a security fence in order to protect its citizens against continued terrorist attacks. Let us not deduct the cost of the fence from our loan guarantees.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month and to honor all of the contributions of the Latino community in the United States.

Right now, the Latino community is the largest minority group in America, with over 37 million people. We continue to become more powerful and a more dominant force in the United States. In fact, this year, we will have a purchasing power within the Latino community reaching almost \$600 billion. Marketers and advertisers, CEOs and companies are realizing that we are a target for consuming, and we are becoming the fastest growing consumer sector in this Nation.

Our increasing power and influence in this country cannot be ignored. So this week, so many Latino groups are in town preparing an agenda for the future, and a good Hispanic agenda is a good agenda for America.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2555, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 374

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2555) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 374 is a rule that provides for the consideration of the conference report for the fiscal year 2004 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. This is a standard rule for a conference report, providing for 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

As we continue the 2004 appropriations cycle, Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the first appropriations bill, and now the first conference report this House considers, is the Homeland Security Appropriations Act. It has been over 2 years since the Nation was savagely attacked by a group of cowardly terrorists on September 11, 2001. Appropriate, decisive, and necessary steps in our defense and foreign policy have been evident under the leadership of President Bush through successful efforts to eliminate al Qaeda from its government-sponsored haven of Afghanistan, the elimination of the Taliban regime and, recently, to remove the ruthless dictator Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and operations throughout the world in furtherance of U.S. national security.

The U.S. military has performed and succeeded with distinction each and every time we have called upon their gallant services. But much more work has to be accomplished in the homeland; and this legislation, Mr. Speaker, provides communities the necessary tools to effect necessary security efforts.

In this conference report, Congress is providing almost \$30 billion to protect the homeland, \$1 billion above the President's request.

The legislation provides \$4.2 billion to the Office of Domestic Preparedness.

I have seen firsthand the work of Federal dollars when supplemented with State and local funding to make our communities safe. In south Florida, the local governments and municipalities have taken extensive steps to ensure the safety of airports, seaports, utilities, and water supplies; but they still require the supplemental funding and grants that this legislation provides. With over 7,500 miles of land borders and 361 seaports, local authorities will always be the frontline of defense.

First responders are the key to the effective protection of our communities. In addition to many other programs, this conference report provides \$1.7 billion for basic formula grants under the Office of Domestic Preparedness; \$500 million for State and local enforcement terrorism prevention grants; \$750 million for firefighter grants, and \$725 million for high-threat, high-density urban areas.

To further ensure the safety of the American people, we have instituted very clear guidelines for grant eligibility. Local and State officials must create a multiyear homeland security plan. This will ensure that we are not just throwing money at the problem, but we are working to find comprehensive, long-term solutions to problems.

The Department of Homeland Security is also working hard to protect our ports of entry. There is \$62 million in this bill for the Container Security Initiative. It is our belief that security at our ports should be the last line of defense, not a first.

Through the Container Security Initiative, the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection is working with the world's largest ports to screen cargo before it leaves for the United States. We now require 24-hour advanced notice for manifests of any cargo ship heading to the United States. This allows the Department of Homeland Security to see what is on a ship before it gets anywhere near the coasts of the United States. Through a sophisticated database screening system and ground personnel working with host countries, the Department is creating a frontline of defense hundreds, sometimes even thousands of miles away.

This conference report also provides \$236 million for immigration services, \$80 million of which is dedicated to alleviating the current unsatisfactory backlog of immigration applications. Under President Bush's Blueprint for New Beginnings, Director Aduardo Aguirre of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services is committed to achieving a maximum term of 6 months for immigration applications between the time of application and the time of swearing in, including for citizenship, specifically. Some parts of our Nation have seen the wait for citizenship applications grow and grow to the point that now it is not anywhere near 6 months, but rather years, in many instances. Effective funding to eliminate this backlog and streamline the process is essential, as is congressional oversight; and I want to thank

the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) who, in the Committee on Rules yesterday evening, again committed to continuing forceful oversight to make sure that this goal of the President and of the director really is achieved. Six months, 6 months should be the maximum time between an application for citizenship and the swearing in of a new American.

Easing the backlog will enhance national security by ensuring that those who should be in the country are given their citizenship papers and those who have goals other than enjoying American prosperity and freedom and may seek to potentially harm America are quickly removed from the consideration process and dealt with appropriately.

We must also allow those with a desire to enter the United States legally to do so without undue burden. Again, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the chairman and the administration to ensure that, with necessary security, the borders of this country remain open to those who seek freedom and prosperity.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO) for their important bipartisan work on this very important appropriations bill which I think, appropriately, is the first one that we bring in final form before our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2555 is good legislation essential to our continued commitment to the security and safety of all of the citizens and the residents of the United States, the well-being of the homeland. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been described as historic because it is the first bill appropriating funds for the new Department of Homeland Security. But because of an economy that continues to lag and the largest deficit in history, and the mounting costs of rebuilding Iraq, this government is in bad fiscal shape. Nonetheless, we have to do whatever is required to secure the country. Does this bill provide enough money for aviation security, for safety around the perimeter of the Nation's airports, for security at our economically-vital ports, and for the Coast Guard to fulfill its previous and additional duties? This body agreed that all cargo traveling on passenger planes would be fully screened, but that security measure was dropped from the bill; and full screening of cargo on passenger planes will not be required.

Are we providing enough money to prepare our first responders, the local police departments and emergency medical agencies? Recently, the Council on Foreign Relations issued a comprehensive report on the status of America's first responders. The council found that its dedicated police officers, firefighters, and emergency personnel are underfunded and underresourced. In fact, it determined that the first responders need an additional \$98.4 billion to meet their needs. We know, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of whether or not we train them adequately or provide them with the equipment that they need, when called upon, they will go. But surely they deserve from this government a chance to increase their odds to the greatest extent possible.

Are we dedicating enough resources to secure our northern border? I represent the second biggest gateway between the United States and Canada, and I see the need to increase the resources along the over 4,000-mile border between the United States and Canada. For years, we did not need to pay attention to our northern border because our Canadian friends and the United States were such good, compatible friends. In fact, it was the largest unguarded border in the world. But if we are going to maintain the \$1.5 million trade between the United States and Canada every single day and still maintain the United States' and Canada's safety and security, we have to provide enough resources to do it.

In conference, an additional \$1.25 billion for airport and seaport security for first responders and for more Customs officials on the northern border was sought. But, unfortunately, the proposal was refused.

Mr. Speaker, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security was also a historic event. The Department was recently described as the "government's hobbled giant." Will DHS be known for its disorganization? Will the Department be able to use effectively and efficiently this nearly-\$30 billion investment in homeland security? Will the Department perform a complete national threat assessment, which has been required for 2 years and we still do not have, but is a necessity to develop and implement a comprehensive homeland security plan? Will the Department develop the criteria for the evaluation of our preparedness so that local and State governments are able to determine the readiness and needs of first responders? And will the Department quickly get the grant money to the local first responders?

□ 1030

The testimony that we have had at our hearings recently does not give us much hope.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it must be noted that next week is the end of the current fiscal year. And, in fact, fiscal year 2004 begins one week from today. However, Congress has not sent any bills making appropriations for fiscal

year 2004 to the President's desk for his signature. If we are lucky, we might have three of the 13 appropriations bills ready to become law by October 1.

Mr. Speaker, finishing only 23 percent of our work on time is not acceptable, and we can and should do better for the people of this great and wonderful country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that all of the appropriations bills, all 13, have been promptly completed by this House. And I think that it stands as a testament to the hard work of the leadership of this House and especially of that very hard-working Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of Chairman YOUNG and the subcommittee chairs.

We obviously can, working hard, fulfill our responsibilities as the Committee on Appropriations has done in this House. We do not control the other House. We wish that they would also complete their work in a timely fashion as this House has.

Now, this is the first appropriations bill that is finalized in the sense of a conference, the final product. We are looking forward to many others being able to be sent shortly to the President for his signature. But I feel very proud of the work of this House and especially the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for her leadership on this bill along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

We cannot be debating a more important issue to our homeland security than how much money the Federal Government is going to spend over the next year to secure the people of our country. The President has been able to find a way to spend \$87 billion in Iraq to protect American security on top of an additional \$65 billion which we have already spent, but this administration can only find an additional 2 percent for homeland security. And after inflation, that pretty much gobbles it up.

While this theory that somehow or other al Qaeda is going to be attacking us 5,000 miles away and not here on our own shore belies the reality of where the threat is to the American people which is in their homes, in their places of work.

Now, just a couple of months ago on this House floor, we passed an amendment by a vote of 278 to 146. That amendment required that in addition to each of us who are passengers on planes in America having to take off

our shoes, having to put our cell phones through security, having to put our computers through security, having to put our carry-on bags through security, having to put our luggage, if it is too big, down and under the plane through security, that the cargo which goes on those very same passenger planes is also screened.

Believe it or not, although 22 percent of all air cargo in the United States is placed on passenger planes that we all fly on, there is no screening program. So as we all sit up in the passenger seats now, thinking that everyone who is seated with us in the passenger section has also been screened, and thereby we are safe because there are two air marshals, there is a double-reinforced steel door on the pilot's cabin, the pilot may have a gun, every passenger may be looking to see how they may respond if al Qaeda jumps up on that plane as to how they will tackle al Qaeda, but in the cargo bin of that very same plane, a package just this size, the same size as your luggage goes on that plane without being screened. Cargo.

Now, there is something wrong when your luggage, which is this size, gets screened but a piece of cargo does not get screened. Al Qaeda, not even flying on that plane, not even flying on that plane, can send cargo on that same plane unscreened, unseen, that destroys that plane. And the consequence would be another half-a-trillion or trillion-dollar hit to our economy.

So here is the bizarre situation in which we now see ourselves as the Republicans bring this bill out on the House floor, we, the average American, will have to go through airport security doing whatever it is that those screeners ask us to do. And we do not mind, we want security for our families, for our country, but going around the screening is the cargo on the very same plane.

By the way, with those people who put the cargo on the plane not flying on it, unless, if you followed this a couple of weeks ago, there was a young man who actually shipped himself across the country. Thank God that young man was a tourist and not a terrorist. That is where we are.

You can get a bomb onto a plane without a boarding pass. You can go right around the whole system that all of us have to go through to get on that passenger plane. So in this bill, rather than accepting the amendment which passed here on the House floor, which would require the TSA to construct a plan to ensure that there is a screening for cargo which goes on passenger planes, instead they removed it on a partisan, Republican-Democrat, vote in the conference committee, party line.

So while the passengers are having their nail clippers taken away from them because it may pose a threat to security on the plane, a piece of cargo can go on without any screening whatsoever. Now, that is just wrong. At Logan Airport, which I represent, 2

years ago, 10 al Qaeda, who had a sleeper cell in our city, got on 2 planes and terrorized our country and the world by then destroying the lives of not only the passengers on that plane from New England, but also 3,000 additional lives in New York City and a good chunk of our economy. We cannot run the risk on those very same planes taking off today, that al Qaeda could put cargo on the very same passenger flights without any screening. And I do not think the American people want to fly on planes that do not have cargo which is screened.

This provision, which has been deleted, has been endorsed by Coalition of Airline Pilots Association. All the airline pilots in America endorse the provision.

Let me read what the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 have to say about this provision. Here is what they say in a letter to us: "The victims of Pan Am Flight 103 Organization is dedicated to and strives for passenger planes to be as secure as possible. Our goal is to have 100 percent physical screening of passengers, crew, luggage and cargo. Trading lives or dollars is totally unacceptable to the families who have paid the price of ineffective security."

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I had not intended to speak on the rule. I was going to wait and present the material that I have on the debate on the conference report itself, but I cannot let the gentleman's remarks go unresponded to at this point in time.

It is just not so that anyone can place cargo on a passenger plane without it being checked and screened. That is incorrect. We have a very sophisticated system in place today that verifies whether or not you are a known and trusted shipper. If you are not so certified by the government after having been investigated and your background checked and all of those procedures, if you are not a known shipper, they will search your packages you put on the passenger plane.

The gentleman is incorrect, and I do not want it to be said nor heard around the world that you can get by with the things he said. You cannot. Today you cannot. And yet in this bill, in the conference report, we direct the Secretary to research, procure and install machinery that can x-ray all this cargo going on passenger planes. We do not have the equipment today to do that, and so we rely upon the known shipper program; and if you are not a known shipper, we personally inspect your cargo.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I must say the gentleman's comments are very, very appropriate. I am taking a group of 16 Members over to Iraq this weekend to begin to try to lay the foundation for a better understanding of what is happening there by Americans; but to have this kind of outrageous presentation on the floor, which could very well tempt kooks in the world to do things that otherwise they would never think of doing, is absolutely not acceptable. And the House should react the same way the gentleman is reacting. I appreciate the chairman yielding me time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am not characterizing the comment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). All I am saying is do not be overly alarmed, for goodness sakes.

There is a program in place while we get the machinery to actually x-ray the cargo that goes on passenger planes. We do not have it now, and it is going to take some time to develop, but in the meantime we are doing the next best thing, and that is certifying who it is we are receiving cargo from to put on those planes and directing the Secretary to proceed forthwith at the earliest date possible to secure the machinery to make that happen.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my respect for both the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for their work on H.R. 2555, the conference report on fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security appropriations.

I think it is important that we raise some of the questions that we are hearing from our constituents back home and from the people who are operating security at some of our airports.

□ 1045

I think that the questions that were raised by my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) are appropriate, but those are the same issues that are raised to us when we tour some of the airports in our districts and in our States. But I want to add my voice to the growing concern that a number of people have, that the Federal Government is cutting back dramatically on our commitment to our Nation's airports at a very critically important time. Just now the American traveling public is beginning to regain confidence in flying since the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, and we must continue to reward that confidence by funding the necessary number of baggage screeners at our Nation's airports.

Earlier this week I had the privilege to tour Logan International Airport in Boston, Massachusetts, with the CEO of the Massachusetts Port Authority, the airport operator and the airport's Federal security director. Regrettably, Logan is remembered by many as the airport from which both planes that hit the World Trade Center Towers were hijacked. What is not as well known is that no other airport in the country has moved more quickly and aggressively to address passenger security than Logan.

Massport and the TSA at Logan enjoy a tremendous cooperative relationship reinforced by daily meetings 7 days a week. Logan has the Nation's only fully automated 100 percent bag screening system at a major airport, and unlike airline hub airports where many passengers are connecting from one gate to another and never pass a security checkpoint or have their luggage screened, 90 percent of Logan's departing passengers will go through a checkpoint, and most of those will check at least one bag.

Despite these challenges, the screeners at Logan have done a tremendous job in protecting the 11 million passengers that depart that airport every year. These screeners do an incredible job. It is hard work. These people who work to screen baggage and do other things to enhance the security at that airport do tremendous work. And they do not get the gratitude, quite frankly, they deserve.

The TSA at Logan will never compromise safety, but their staffing levels at Logan have been steadily decreasing this year, and this inevitably will result in longer lines at checkpoints and delays. At a time when we are trying to help the commercial airline industry do better, it seems to me that we need to be sensitive to the fact that without proper staffing we will see longer and longer lines.

There are currently 100 fewer screeners at Logan than when the Federal Government took over. That is unimaginable. We cannot continue to bail out airlines without first meeting our commitment to our Nation's airports.

This whole procedure, this conference report, began with providing 56,000 screeners. Then it went to 49,000, and now this bill caps screeners at 45,000. With all due respect to the great work that the chairman and others have done, I think we need to do better, and I hope that at some point in this process we will find a way to do that.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), who is the ranking member on the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we all know it is the first duty of this Congress to protect and provide for the defense of the American people. In the first days of the 21st century, this means that we have to do everything

we can to protect America from terrorist attack.

After September 11, the question that each of us must answer is are we doing all we can to protect America. With only 3 percent of our cargo containers being checked as they enter American ports, can we say that we are doing enough to close that security gap?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman not aware of the container security initiative where we are checking these containers at 24 megaports around the world, even as I speak?

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am very much aware of it. I am just convinced that we are not doing it enough, and we are not providing the essential security that we need.

I participated just yesterday in an exercise out at the National Defense University, went through a simulation of a terrorist attack utilizing container cargo. The estimates of the devastation to our country and our economy that something coming through on cargo containers would do to this Nation is shocking, and I think it is very important that we do even more than we are doing today.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield briefly on that point, I agree with the gentleman, we should do all we can. However, it is inaccurate to say we are only checking 3 percent of these container pieces. We are doing a lot more than that.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do agree we are doing more than we were. The question is are we doing enough to protect America?

When we look at what we are doing to protect our borders, we have yet to meet the levels that we mandated in the PATRIOT Act for border security guards, and we clearly do not know today who comes into this country and who leaves this country, and that is without dispute. We also know that we have got 12 incompatible terrorist watch lists, and it has been 2 years since we all knew that we had to have a common single watch list to be sure that all agencies of government knew who was on the terrorist watch list. We know the Coast Guard struggles with outdated equipment, equipment that needs to be upgraded. The list could go on and on and on.

The Council on Foreign Relations issued a report just about a month ago entitled Emergency Responders Drastically Underfunded, Dangerously Unprepared, a bipartisan report issued by a bipartisan group chaired by Warren Rudman, former Republican Senator.

There seems to be no question, Mr. Speaker, that we must do more to protect the security of America, and when we look at it in the context of the priorities, what we see is the increase in

the Homeland Security budget provided by this conference report is only 2½ percent above what it was last year. That is a \$535 million increase in funding for Homeland Security, and keep in mind, this Homeland Security budget funds all these 22 agencies that we had in existence before we combined them into one agency. So we are really paying for a whole lot in this bill that we were already doing, and the total increase is about the rate of inflation.

In terms of priority, the President has requested that we spend approximately \$20 billion additional to rebuild Iraq, and it is probably just a down payment. We are spending only 2½ percent additional on homeland security, 2½ percent of that \$20 billion here at home to protect America. When we look at the total size of this increase, \$535 million, that is just one one-thousandth of the size of the deficit that we have this year.

So in terms of priorities, there should be no debate that we are not doing enough to protect America, to protect America from chemical attack, from biological attack, from nuclear attack, from traditional explosives. This is what the war on terror is all about, and we must wake up and be prepared to defend America against the terrorist enemies that we know are plotting as we speak to harm America and American citizens here and around the world.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for us to be real about what our needs are in the area of homeland security. I will be the first to tell my colleagues that we also need to get smarter about how we spend our money. That is why the Democrats on the Select Committee on Homeland Security, joined by most of the Democratic Caucus, will introduce legislation today to create a task force that will be a grassroots group of local responders that will advise the Department of Homeland Security as to what the legitimate essential needs are of every community in America, because today we do not pass out money on any rational basis.

Let us get smarter, let us get real, and let us be honest about the security needs of this country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as we debate a bill to ensure that our homeland is secure, while we struggle to reconcile another \$87 billion of war expenses, this Congress has once again provided a special benefit to a handful of financial traitors who have literally skipped out on paying the bill.

The House Committee on Appropriations unanimously passed an amendment to prohibit lucrative Federal contracts from being awarded to corporations who run offshore to avoid U.S. income taxes. Then the Committee on Rules struck it out. Then the Senate passed an amendment on the floor to prohibit these contracts with tax

cheats. Then the conference committee struck it out.

Sound familiar? I feel like Bill Murray in Groundhog Day. No matter how hard we try, we keep hitting it from every angle, but nothing seems to work to get these companies to come back to the United States and pay their fair share of taxes. It seems that there are some in this Congress who are intent on protecting the new Bermuda citizenship of these companies. We end up where we started at the beginning, with corporate expatriates avoiding \$5 billion, listen to that, \$5 billion in taxes, and yet they win \$2 billion annually in lucrative Federal contracts with the United States Government, 70 percent of which are in defense and homeland security.

By a whopping vote of 318 to 110, this House last year voted to prohibit these corporate expatriates from sharing in the increase of contracts with the new Homeland Security Department. Senator Wellstone added similar language during the Senate debate, but after Wellstone's death and after the election was over, the bill came back, and guess what, we got rid of the provision.

Despite a promise from House and Senate leadership during a close vote to three Republican Senators that this contract ban, and two other controversial provisions, would be fixed in later legislation, no ban has been enacted.

These corporations benefit from America's defense and homeland security, but they are not willing to help pay for it. With 150,000 soldiers in Iraq today willing to give their lives for this great Nation, Congress should ensure that the resources exist to support that effort. If the tide of corporations flowing offshore for tax avoidance continues, those resources are put at serious risk. It is shameful that this year we have nothing again to show for our efforts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Let me go through this once again. If you are on a passenger plane, and this is the size of your carry-on luggage, you have to put that luggage through screening, each person in America, no exceptions; Members of Congress, no exception. We are known trippers. They do not say to Members of Congress, oh, we know who you are, you are a known tripper, just bring that bag right around security. They do not say to businessmen who fly between New York and Boston every day, you are a known tripper, come right around security, we are only going to check these people who do not fly that often. No. Every single one of our carry-on pieces of luggage gets screened, and that is the way it should be, no exceptions for Members of Congress, no exceptions for business people, no exceptions for anybody.

But if you have got a piece of cargo, and they say you are a known shipper,

they do not put it through any screening on the same plane that we are on.

But listen to this: If it is under 16 ounces, and, by the way, Richard Reid, who had explosive plastic material in his shoes had less than this, this does not get screened. There is no paperwork required. There is no known shipper program. Nothing, if it is 16 ounces and under to go on passenger planes if it is cargo.

Now, that is a huge loophole. Why can we not screen this? What is so complicated about screening this going onto passenger planes?

□ 1100

Why is there no equipment to do this? If you can screen a huge bag which we are all taking on our vacation for 10 days, how can a cargo shipper who is putting this on a plane not have it screened; does not even require paperwork, if we know an explosive could be put in it? It is wrong, and this bill should be defeated.

We owe the passengers of America the knowledge that as they put their families on planes to fly around this country that this package is being screened; that there is paperwork that is attached to it; that we know what is in it as we are putting it on a passenger plane. This bill says no, we are not going to have a requirement. We are not going to make that a part of the compact which we have with American people for homeland security.

We know there is no uranium or nuclear weapons in Iraq. We now know that. But we know that al Qaeda is still in our country trying to figure out ways of targeting the airline industry. Give them the right to know that their families are safe. Vote "no" on this homeland security bill until they give every American family that level of protection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations, who along with the rest of the subcommittee has been working long and hard, and not with empty shoeboxes but for the security of the American people, actually getting things done.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take that time.

I cannot believe the gentleman from Massachusetts would stand before the body and make the statements, as he did, without knowing the facts. The 16-ounce package the gentleman held before us and said this is not searched, this is not searched, this is not searched, all packages under 16 ounces are checked by canine teams. And I would trust the canine teams more than the gentleman from Massachusetts on this point.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. First of all, Madam Speaker, all packages 16 ounces and

under are not checked by canine. They have a pilot project to check some of the packages 16 ounces and under. They do not have every 16-ounce package checked by canine.

Moreover, why in the world should everyone in these galleries, every American have to take off their shoes, put through their computer, put all of their packages through screening and then have a dog sniff however many packages the cargo shipper or the airlines feel like they should sniff? Why should those packages not get the same screening? Why should there be any risk of mistake?

They do not screen us by sniffing dogs. They do not have dogs sniffing our bags or our packages. They want to make sure that it is absolutely guaranteed that no one is getting on to the passenger section of a plane with an explosive. It is just wrong. It makes no sense, in fact. Why make people take off their shoes if someone can put it on in the belly of the same plane without the same screening? It makes no sense.

We should have a known-tripper program, then. Let 98 percent of all Americans get on with no screening because we know they are not a big risk. We do not say it that way. We say we are not taking any chances with the lives and safety of Americans on planes. We are going to have everyone go through. Regardless of status, regardless of income, everyone goes through. And I think it is reassuring to other Americans when they see Members of Congress taking off their shoes, putting their own carry-ons through. I think they know that we are serious about it. But they know we cannot possibly be serious when their nail clippers are being confiscated and they bite their own nails while they watch the cargo go onto the same plane with no physical screening at all.

Vote "no." It is just not a good enough bill on the issue that we know al Qaeda still puts at the very top of their list the airlines of our country with passengers on them. We owe those people better 2 years after what happened on September 11.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I am proud to be a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security; but having attended all the hearings that we have had, I have been struck by the fact that, basically, in 2 years, we have not achieved a great deal. The watch list is one item that particularly concerns me, and I do not think we are paying enough attention to what I would like to call the enemy within.

I was struck this week by the two men who were charged with espionage who worked at Guantanamo, one a chaplain, the other working for the United States Government. And as we work to make America safe, if we do all our concentrations and spend all of our money on securing the borders from people coming in and forget and do not put adequate emphasis on the people who are here already, then I

think we are missing the chance to do our job adequately, nor should the American people feel any safer.

I agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) said, this could be a better bill. I wish it could be. And certainly I want to reiterate what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) said. It has been one of the sorrows of my life watching the inability of Congress to say to corporations who have the gall to incorporate overseas to avoid paying Federal taxes yet are awarded Federal contracts. Surely, surely we can do better than that and finally at least stop that hemorrhage.

It has troubled me all the way through to see some of the contractors out here doing the work on the Capitol itself and who are working for corporations that have gone to Bermuda. If they are saying to the United States residents, here, you go ahead and pay for the war yourself, we opt out, but please give us the contracts, we ought to be smart enough, we ought to be intelligent enough to put a stop to that.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This has been an interesting debate. I feel very proud of the work that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and his subcommittee have done in bringing forth this legislation, which is not only the first appropriation bill that is being sent to the President but one could say certainly one of the most important, if not the most important one.

Many important programs are funded. I happen to have followed, and feel very strongly, for example, that the funding in this bill and the oversight that Chairman ROGERS is providing to make sure that the goal that President Bush has set for immigrants in this country who are seeking the great honor of American citizenship is met; that there be no more than a 6-month period between the time of application and swearing in for immigrants in this great land. We are going to follow up with oversight to make sure that that goal of President Bush and Director Aguirre is met. It is funded in this legislation.

Many important security initiatives are also funded. Chairman ROGERS has stated, and I think it is important to reiterate that the Secretary of the Department has been instructed to forthwith devise and implement a system for the screening of all cargo. So in addition to the very important existing programs that have been improved and their funding has been increased to assure the security of the American people today, this legislation calls for the development forthwith of a program to screen all cargo. I thank Chairman ROGERS and his committee for that work as well.

So this is very important legislation that is brought forth today with this rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2658, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP- PROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. LEWIS of California (during consideration of H. Res. 374) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 108-283)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2658) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$28,247,667,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$23,217,298,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$8,971,897,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$22,910,868,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,568,725,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$2,002,727,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$571,444,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,288,088,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code,